UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	4233-4002	5757

7590   03/15/2004

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	7

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/865,773	Applicant(s) SUDA ET AL.
	Examiner Srirama Channavajjala	Art Unit 2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 May 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-79</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-79</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09/865,773</u>.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-6</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings filed on 8/4/2002 are <u>objected to</u> by the Draftsperson under

37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152, formal drawings are required in response to this office action,

paper no.7

Priority

2.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an

application Serial No. 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601, filed in JAPAN on

5/29/2000, 7/7/2000,10/16/2000 respectively. It is noted, however, that applicant has

not filed a certified copy of the 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601 applications

as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/25/2001, paper no. #

3; 4/11/2002, paper no. # 4; 12/8/2003, paper no. # 5; 8/28/2003, paper no. # 6

respectively acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37

CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the

examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 7.

Claim Objections

4. At page 46, line 1-2, *Claim 15*, line 4-11, *Claim 14* objected to under 37

CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper numbering form for failing to further limit the subject

matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the

claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in

independent form. For compact prosecution, examiner assumes the following in the

office action, and treated as stated below:

> ### *At page 46, line 1-2, Claim 15 as Claim 78 dependent on Claim 14*
>
> ### *At page 46, line 4-11, Claim 14 as Claim 79 dependent on Claim 1*

Appropriate correction is required in response to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.   Claims 1-8,13-15,18-20, 58-71,78-79, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319.

6.   As to Claims 1,58-60, Ambroziak teaches a system which including 'data

acquisition means for acquiring data' [see Abstract, col 2, line 38-39, col 6, line 4-7],

Ambroziak is directed to intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual

indexer, more specifically using network browser, extracting information or data from the

required document as detailed in Abstract, acquiring data corresponds to extracting

information from the content of the document; 'determination means for determining

whether user requests saving of the acquired data' [col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2],

Ambroziak firstly, teaches user interface where user has the ability to select required

buttons as detailed in fig 13, secondly, when user selects "GO TO URL" button that

activates respective URL or phrase to browser element 210 to access identified server

and retrieves the relevant information, therefore, as best understood by the examiner,

data or information has already been saved, so that user can access identified server to

retrieve specific information as detailed in col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-2; 'indexing

means for assigning a predetermined index to the data requested for saving' [col 3,

line 55-59, col 5, line 49-56]; 'index dynamically assigned to the data' [col 3, line 21-28,

col 5, line 24-29,col 7, line 2-8], Ambroziak teaches dynamically organizing information,

more specifically dynamically organized in real-time during browsing, i.e., index

controller controls the operations of browser guide element 10, and dynamically updates

information; 'saving means for saving the requested data and the assigned index in a

predetermined storage unit' [col 6, line 16-26].

7.   As to Claim 2, Ambroziak teaches a system which including 'acquisition means

acquires data from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an

Internet' [see fig 1-2col 5, line 24-29], browsing of daa in an Internet corresponds to

Ambroziak's fig 1-2.

8.   As to Claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined storage is a database'

[see fig 2], predetermined storage database corresponds to fig 2, element 150, 'system

further comprising data retrieving means for retrieving data from the database based on

a user-supplied index, said user-supplied index specified by a user' [fig 2, col 6, line 43-

49].

9.   As to Claim 4, 64, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sorting means for sorting indices of

the daa in the storage unit' [col 8, line 56-58], sorting indices corresponds to query

results ordered on ranked based because results of a query on index or URLs as

detailed col 8, line 51-58; 'display means for displaying a result of the sorting by said

sorting means' [col 8, line 51-53].

10.   As to Claim 5, 65, 68, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of Claim 4 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'soring means performs

the sorting based on a plurality of types of indices' [col 8, line 56-58, line 65-67, col 9,

line 1-9], also see fig 1, element 140, 130; plurality of types of indices corresponds to fig

1, element 130,140.

11.   As to Claim 6, 66, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'selecting means for selecting an

index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 8, line 65-67, col 9, line 1-

2]; 'retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said

selecting means from the database' [col 9, line 12-22].

12.   As to Claim 7, 67, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'deleting means for deleting at least

one index from the indices displayed on said display means, removal means for

removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the

database' [col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6], as best understood by the examiner,

Ambroziak specifically suggests various buttons such as browse, query, freeze, exclude

and like in a graphical user environment [see fig 13], further, Ambroziak also suggests

for example updating information, more specifically index server updating all active

information affected by changes to index as detailed in col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6.

13.   As to Claim 8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 4, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sorting means places the plurality of

values at positions corresponding to respective values' [col 8, line 56-58].

14.   As to Claim 13, Ambroziak disclosed 'acquires URL of the data from the browser

as the index' [col 6, line 43-49].

15.   As to Claim 14, Ambroziak disclosed 'indexing means acquires at least one of a

keyword or a title embedded in the data from the browser as the index' [col 6, line 43-

45], keyword corresponds to query word or phrase.

16.   As to Claim 15, Ambroziak disclosed 'network and each of the group

corresponds to a session for the network' [col 1, line 21-26].

17.   As to Claim 18, Ambroziak disclosed 'assigning a word specified by a user as a

further index to the data to be saved' [col 9, line 24-29, line line 53-56].

18.   As to Claim 19-20, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1, above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'saving means saves the data as a

new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user' [col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1-6].

19.   As to Claim 61, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined index is dynamically generated' [col 3, line 22-29, col 5, line 25-30].

20.   As to Claim 62, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'predetermined storage unit is a daabase' [col 5, line 42-44].

21.   As to Claim 63, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'retrieving data from said database based on a user-supplied index' [col 6, line 43-49].

22.   As to Claim 69-70, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'sending the acquired data to a predetermined destination' [col 6, line 59-65].

23.   As to Claim 71, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 60 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'data is acquired from a browser

client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an Internet' [see fig 1,3, col 7,

line 16-20].

24.   As to Claim 78, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'displays the keyword or the title

acquired from the browser' [col 6, line 43-52].

25.   As to Claim 79, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Ambroziak disclosed 'node creation means for creating

nodes corresponding to groups classified' [col 3, line 21-29, col 4, line 25-35], 'node

creation means creates a hierarchical nodes by dividing a group corresponding to a

period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating

a node corresponding to each of sub group' [col 4, line 1-18, line 45-55]; 'node

displaying means for displaying a plurality of nodes created by said node creation

means in an order of saving' [col 5, line 1-8,fig 13-14].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

26.   Claims 9-12,16-17,72-74, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319 as applied to claims 1, 60

above, and further in view of Smith et al., [hereafter Smith], US Patent No.6578078

27.   As to Claim 9-10, 72-74,, Ambroziak disclosed labels represent web page,

document, file etc., [col 5, line 63-67]. It is however, noted that Ambroziak does not

specifically teach 'folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed

data', 'predetermined name to the newly browsed data', new folder with the assigned

file name'. On the other hand, Smith disclosed folder creation means for creating a new

folder for newly browsed data', 'predetermined name to the newly browsed data', new

folder with the assigned file name' [fig 9C, col 16, line 17-35]., Smith specifically teaches

various folders and related files with specific folder and file names as detailed in fig 9c.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of smith et al., into intelligent network

browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because both Smith and

Ambroziak are directed to Browsing Internet, more specifically Smith is directed to

preserving integrity within the web sites, that including updating links to external web

sites [see Abstract, fig 4], while Ambroziak is directed to networking browser is used

retrieving information or documents, analyzing the conceptual information, assembling

index of the extracted information that reflects relations based on semantic data [see

Abstract, col 2, line 38-45] and are from same field of endeavor. One of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to modify

Ambroziak's reference, more specifically modifying fig 2 to incorporate Smith's file

structure or meta data files consisting of root folder, sub folders, and files with

respective folder and file names as detailed in fig 9c, col 16, line 17-30, also because

that would have allowed uses of Ambroziak to properly organize specific web pages or

related information, thus improving quality and reliability of the system.

28.   As to Claim 11, Smith disclosed 'folder name is a fixed name' [see fig 9c].

29.   As to Claim 12, Smith disclosed 'file name generation means for generating a

unique file name for the newly browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 11, line

23-38], unique file name corresponds to sub-folder element 334 containing HTML

document element 335; 'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data with

adding the generated file name' [col 11, line 38-47].

30.   As to Claim 16-17, Smith disclosed 'data is file data and each of the group

corresponds to a period from a start to an end of a file system' [col 13, line 40-50].

31.   Claims 21- 39, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319 as applied to claims 1, above, and further in

view of Itakura et al., [hereafter Itakura], US Patent No.6351745

32.   As to Claim 21, Ambroziak teaches accessing and storing the information [col 2,

line 38-45], however, Ambroziak does not specifically teach 'comparing means for

comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined time', 'removal

means for removing data in correspond ace with the effective period before the current

time based upon the result of a comparison '. On the other hand, Itakura disclosed

'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a

predetermined time' [col 21, line 12], 'removal means for removing data in correspond

ace with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison '[col 21, line 34-41].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Itakura et al., into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because both are directed to accessing information, more specifically Ambroziak is directed to network browsing to receive documents [see Abstract]; while Itakura is directed to communication system for distributing message as advertisement to user of terminal, more specifically communication network for distributing information to users[see Abstract], both Itakura, and Ambroziak teach Internet [see Ambroziak: fig 1; Itakura: fig 1 and 3] and are from same field of endeavor. One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would have been motivated to combined the references because that would have allowed users of Ambroziak's intelligent network browser for receiving document to control which relative combination of individual documents at predetermined time interval, further updating information is automatically transmitted to the user from the list that satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Itakura et al., [col 5, line 30-35], tus improving quality and reliability of the system.

33. As to Claim 22, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined timing is a time when the system accepts no operations by a user' [col 20, line 59-65].

34.   As to Claim 23-24, Itakura disclosed 'removal means requests a user to confirm

the removal of the data and removes the confirmed data' [col 21, line 56-65].

35.   As to Claim 25, Itakura disclosed 'effective period is not specified by the user,

said saving means saves the data in correspondence with a non-limited effective period'

[col 20, line 52-55].

36.   As to Claim 26, 29, 38, Itakura disclosed 'saving means saves the browsed data

in a first save mode and saves the URL in place of the browsed data in a second save

mode' [col 8, line 8-11, col 10, line 1-7].

37.   As to Claim 27-28, Itakura disclosed 'saving means saves the browsed data with

data linked thereto' [col 9, line 8-13].

38.   As to Claim 30, Itakura disclosed 'saving means is controlled not to save the

browsed data in a URL specified by the user in advance' [col 15, line 24-32].

39.   As to Claim 31,mbroziak teaches a system which including 'index extracting

means for extracting as an index a specific data from the data train' [fig 1-2, col 2, line

38-42, col 3, line 22-32]. On the other hand, Itakura disclosed 'address of the browsed

data in the network on the basis of a predetermined rule' [col 13, line 8-17].

40.   As to Claim 32, 37, Itakura disclosed 'specific data is a domain name' [col 19,

line 60-64].

41.   As to Claim 33, 35, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating

a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and

extracting a domain name from the rest of the data with referring to a knowledge base

of domain names' [col 20, line 6-15].

42.   As to Claim 34, Itakura disclosed 'specific data is a name of organization'

[col 13, line 13-17].

43.   As to Claim 36, Itakura disclosed 'predetermined rule includes a rule for dividing

the rest of the data into partial data with a predetermined symbol and determining each

of the partial data as an organization name' [col 14, line 20-26].

44.   As to Claim 39, Itakura disclosed 'saved data except for an embedded image'

[col 9, line 55-60].

45.   Claims 40-57, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319 as applied to claims 1, above, and further in view of Sidana, US Patent No. 6571295

46.   As to Claim 40, Ambroziak does not disclosed 'editing means for editing the browsed data'. It is however, noted that Sidana disclosed 'editing means for editing the browsed data' [col 7, line 25-40].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Sidana into intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak because both are directed to accessing information, more specifically Ambroziak is directed to network browsing to receive documents [see Abstract]; while Sidana is directed to web page annotating and processing, more specifically user access document from a particular web address and views documents, further it redirector modifies the documents and returns with various comments such as annotations to the original documents [see Abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to incorporate the teachings of adding various comments to the documents of Ambroziak's conceptual information from the content of the documents because that would have allowed users of Ambroziak to retrieve the selected documents with custom information as suggested by Sidana [see col 2, line 53-58] without modifying original documents,

and does not require modification of the browser [col 2, line 46-48], thus improving the

quality with additional information.

47.   As to Claim 41, Sidana disclosed 'editing means includes annotation means for

adding an annotation to the browsed data' [col 6, line 18-30, fig 3, fig 7].

48.   As to Claim 42, Sidana, disclosed 'annotation means adds an annotation in such

a manner that the annotation is distinguishable from the browsed data' [col 6, line 56-

67, col 7, 1-2].

49.   As to Claim 43, Sidana disclosed 'editing means includes changing means for

changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data' [col 7, line 25-35,

fig 7].

50.   As to Claim 44, Sidana disclosed 'extraction means for extracting a

predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 9, line 52-63]; 'extracted data

saving means for saving the extracted data in the database' [col 7, line 8-13].

51.   As to Claim 45, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above

rejection of Claim 44. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'copying operation' [see fig 4,

especially Netscape tol bar: copying, deleting, pasting, save, save as are part of menu

operations].

52.   As to Claim 46, Sidana disclosed 'predetermined type of data includes at least one of an organization name, a person name, an E-mail.....'[see col 10, line 33-36, line 46-50].

53.   As to Claim 47-48, Sidana disclosed 'if the data requested to be saved includes data in other URL, said saving means downloads the included data from the other URL' [col 9, line 28-39].

54.   As to Claim 49, Sidana disclosed 'selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode, said determination means always determines the user requests to save the browsed data without instruction for each of the browsed data' [col 8, line 52-61].

55.   As to Claim 50, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of Claim 49. In addition Sidana disclosed 'client apparatus transmits a user request to said server apparatus and receives a response to the user request from said server apparatus' [fig 1-2col 4, line 20-24]. .

56.   As to Claim 51, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of Claim 50. In addition, both Ambroziak and Sidana teach 'server apparatus acquires data in an internet' [see Ambroziak: fig 1; Sidana: col 4, line 51-53].

57.   As to Claim 52-53, Sidana teaches a system which including 'a local database' [fig 1, element 110]; 'a web information storage device for storing web information acquires from an internet' [fig 1, element 130]; 'administration means for administrating data in either of said database, said local database, and said web information storage device' [fig 1]

58.   As to Claim 54-56, Sidana teaches a system which including 'database is equipped in a server apparatus, and said data acquisition means, said determination means, said indexing means, and said saving means are equipped in at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus' [fig 1, 3, col 3, line 4-9,col 4, line 19-25].

59.   As to Claim 57, the limitation of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 3 above. In addition, both Ambroziak and Sidana teach 'browser connected to said server apparatus, each of said browser browses web page in the internet' [see Ambroziak :fig 1, browser corresponds to browse guide; Sidana: fig 1, element 170].

60.   Claims 75-77, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ambroziak, US Patent No. 6415319, Smith et al., [hereafter Smith], US Patent

No.6578078, as applied to claims 1, 60 above, and further in view of Sidana,

US Patent No. 6571295

61.   As to Claim 75, both Ambroziak, Smith do not teach 'editing the browsed data',

although Ambroziak teaches intelligent network browser using incremental conceptual

indexer [see Abstract], while Smith teaches preserving referential integrity within web

sites [see Abstract, fig 3]. It is however, noted that Sidana disclosed 'editing the

browsed data'[col 7, line 25-40].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Sidana into intelligent network

browser using incremental conceptual indexer of Ambroziak, preserving referential

integrity within web sites of Smith et al. because all are directed to internet related

contents, more specifically all are directed to browsing web sites or web pages

[see Ambroziak: fig 1, Abstract; Smith: fig 3, Abstract; Sidana: Abstract, fig 1]. It would

have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants'

invention to combine the references because that would have allowed uses of

Ambroziak, Smith et al., to edit individual web pages or documents to satisfy his or her

requirements, further bringing the advantages of re-director that accesses the modified.

document and returns the modified document for viewing by other users that including

any additional annotations or comments as suggested by Sidana, Abstract, fig fig 3,

fig 7, thus improving the quality and reliability of the web page processing.

62.   As to Claim 76, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 75 above. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'adding an annotation to the browsed

data, said annotation is distinguishable from the browsed data' [col 6, line 18-30, fig 3,

fig 7].

63.   As to Claim 77, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 71 above. In addition, Sidana disclosed 'extracting a predetermined type of data

from the browsed data' [col 9, line 52-63], 'saving the extracted daa in the storage unit'

[col 7, line 8-13].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	6415319
b.	US Patent No.	6578078
c.	US Patent No.	6571295
d.	US Patent No.	6351745

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

e.	US Patent No.	5900005
f.	US Patent No.	6366956
g.	US Patent No.	5974409
h.	US Patent No.	6070159
i.	US Patent No.	6182063
j.	US Patent No.	5678041
k.	US Patent No.	6505196
l.	US Patent No.	6654749

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238   **(After Final Communication)**

703/872-9306   **(Offical Communications)**

703/746-7240   **(For Status inquiries, draft communication)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

sc
Patent Examiner.
March 11, 2004.